

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION ON HIV

3530 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1140 • Los Angeles, CA 90010 • TEL (213) 738-2816 • FAX (213) 637-4748 www.hivcommission-la.info

While not required of meeting participants, signing-in constitutes public notice of attendance. Presence at meetings is recorded solely based on sign-in sheets, and not signing-in constitutes absence for Commission members. Only members of the Commission on HIV are accorded voting privileges, thus Commissioners who have not signed in cannot vote. Sign-in sheets are available upon request.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 29, 2010



MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	HIV EPI AND OAPP STAFF	COMM STAFF/ CONSULTANTS
Carla Bailey, Co-Chair	Nettie DeAugustine	None	Jane Nachazel
Anthony Braswell, Co-Chair	Jeffrey Goodman		Jim Stewart
Sergio Aviña	Lee Kochems		Glenda Pinney
Al Ballesteros	Mario Pérez	PUBLIC	Craig Vincent-Jones
Whitney Engeran-Cordova	Fariba Younai		Nicole Werner
Michael Johnson		None	
Brad Land			
Angélica Palmeros			
Kathy Watt			

CONTENTS OF COMMITTEE PACKET

- 1) Agenda: Executive Committee Meeting Agenda, 11/29/2010
- 2) Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting, 8/2/2010
- 3) Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting, 8/30/2010
- 4) Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting, 10/4/2010
- 5) Table: Los Angeles County Commission on HIV, Executive Committee, FY 2010 Work Plan, 11/29/2010
- 6) Table: Los Angeles County Commission on HIV, Monthly Task Priority Plan, October 2010, 11/29/2010
- 7) Policy/Procedure: #09.2102: Executive Committee At-Large Member Elections and Terms, 11/29/2010
- 8) Agenda: Commission on HIV Meeting Agenda, 12/9/2010
- 9) Email: DHS/PPP Care Notes, 11/24/2010
- 1. CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Braswell called the meeting to order at 10:15 am.
- 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION #1: Approve the Agenda Order (Passed by Consensus).

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION #2: Approve the 8/2/2010, 8/30/2010 and 10/4/2010 Executive Committee Meeting minutes (Passed by Consensus).

- 4. PARLIAMENTARIAN REMARKS: There was no report.
- 5. PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDIZED: There were no comments.
- **6. COMMISSION COMMENT, NON-AGENDIZED**: Mr. Johnson reminded all that Mr. Ballesteros' Holiday Commission Party would be 12/4/201 at 7:00 pm.
- 7. PUBLIC/COMMISSION COMMENT FOLLOW-UP: There were no comments.

8. CO-CHAIRS' REPORT:

A. Executive Committee Work Plan: Mr. Vincent-Jones noted no changes from the prior month.

B. Monthly Priority Task List:

- Mr. Vincent-Jones noted time was short last month due to the schedule and holidays, but much was accomplished.
- Mr. Engeran-Cordova felt the tool is useful, but a large proportion of the items are past target dates. That undermines its use as a management tool. He recommended more realistic timelines and accountability for each item.
- Mr. Johnson noted the Operations Committee absorbed an unusual amount of time for Annual Meeting materials and subsequent orientation/trainings. He agreed it was reasonable to revise the timeline to account for that.
- Mr. Ballesteros felt there was so much information that outside individuals might use the tool to make judgments on priorities, such as support for outsourcing large projects or reducing funds for smaller ones. He suggested focusing on fewer items as well as identifying whether items are new or are revisions from previously existing items.
- Mr. Land felt it important to identify absolutely have to be done, e.g., policies/procedures could be delayed. A cut-off date for the Standards of Care should also be implemented and the Comprehensive Care Plan work prioritized.
- Mr. Braswell added the new, internal tool summarized the Work Plan, so supported pushing back dates as needed.
- Mr. Vincent-Jones noted that when the Executive Committee initiated the use of the Commission work plan and monthly priorities list, both were cited as possibly overly ambitious planning vehicles, but at least one place that captured all of the work needed, until adjusted accordingly. In addition, he summarized what he considers strengths and weaknesses of the monthly priorities list:

1) Weaknesses:

- Not all work is done sequentially, but often in pieces/stages, and the tool does not provide an opportunity to reflect the percentage of work completed on an item to date. Spending time tracking that information on the tool would not be time-efficient or cost-effective: e.g., POs are not completed all at once and have several stages, but they are not recorded as completed until approved, even though 50% of the work may have been completed on them at any point in time.
- The tool does not reflect the Executive Director's and other staff members' routine work, such as reviewing agendas, minutes and other documents (e.g., the Executive Director drafts and/or edits all agendas, minutes and summaries, and all other office documents); many County-required activities (e.g., invoicing; monthly budgeting/procurement/human resources reports; three 3-4 hour trainings he had to attend in the past two months); routine Commission, committee and work group support work (e.g., the two full days each month that Commission meeting logistics take for all staff); phone conversations; and meetings (which he stated consumes at least half of his time).
- Work demands can be unpredictable and may not be reflected until the work is added to the list, if added, the following month, e.g., on 11/24/2010 he spent the afternoon completing an unanticipated PO request for St. Anne's, and another one or two hours coordinating a radio interview request in which he did not participate.
- Very little attention is paid to the work that has been accomplished to date, which is addressed in the second half of the document. That, he said, might be corrected by putting the accomplished work section first, followed by the continuing work section.
- The list mixes short-, mid- and long-term work projects, which exacerbates the lack of understanding about current project status and the amount of work accomplished for continuing work projects. He also noted that no distinction is made on the list between projects that only require one or multiple hours versus projects that require multiple days or weeks, lending itself to a cursory review that each item identified is of equal time value.
- Some "deadlines" are actual deadlines while others are only target dates. The Committee agreed that the document should continue to be refined to reflect those differences.

2) Strengths:

- It reflects Commission/Executive Committee priorities, which is especially helpful if schedules are interrupted or modified,
- It reflects projected work from the work plan and prompts discussion that helps clarify what feasibly can be completed with existing resources, what must/needs to be done, and what can be delayed/altered, and refining mandatory work, priorities and wish-list work—all of which were its purposes initially. He noted that the combination of the work plan and priorities list has prompted several in-depth conversations about the

- viability/feasibility of projected work and priorities, and availability of resources—although more of those discussions are needed.
- It is a "living document" and intended to be a "working document" that can be revised and modified at any time, not an assessment of Commission accomplishments or effectiveness. To the extent the Committee adequately reviews and considers projected work load issues, the list can and should be further refined (e.g., if there is no chance work will be completed in the following month, should it be included on the list?). He commented that while he or others cannot control why, how or the intentions of people using the document outside of the Executive Committee meetings, the only part of it that can even justifiably used as an assessment of the Commission's effectiveness is the accomplished work section.
- It is an extremely useful tool for him personally, as the Executive Director. Instead of keeping personal "to do" lists, the priorities list serves that purpose well and is something that can be shared with the Executive Committee in its role coordinating Commission work. It is a tool that helps him prioritize work
- Mr. Vincent-Jones added that since review of the priorities list is not adequate reason for Executive Sessions, it is, by nature, a public document—although those who participate in Executive Committee meetings should be counseled extensively about the sensitivity and risks of misuse of a number of documents generated for the Executive Committee. Given it is a public document, the Committee has two options: 1) discontinue use of it, or 2) continue tweaking it until it properly serves the Committee's needs. He recommended the latter option, noting that in spite of its weaknesses, on the whole it is a valuable tool that is increasingly serving a useful role as the Committee becomes more familiar with its use and refines and revises its purpose and presentation.
- Mr. Stewart indicated that just counting the time projected for the tasks in the proposed work in the document represents 373 days of work. While concurring with the overall assessment that there is more work represented in the document than can reasonably be accomplished in the time period projected, Mr. Vincent-Jones counseled against relying too much on that figure specifically by calling attention to the following factors: 1) he has previously noted that projecting the time needed to complete projects is variable, which is why he added the column estimating the actual time it took to complete various tasks; 2) the time projected to complete the tasks depends on multiple parties, but any effort to try and break that down would be arbitrary and too time-consuming; and 3) the actual time estimated for already accomplished tasks represents 150+ days.
- Ms. Watt said she blocks 1.5 days a week for her priorities and suggested Mr. Vincent-Jones also do so. Mr. Vincent-Jones responded that he has tried a similar approach by reserving Fridays for that purpose, which has been helpful to varying degrees, but is not always consistently reliable.
- Mr. Vincent-Jones reminded the Committee that, due to budget reductions, the Commission laid off close to a third of its staff. Those staff, he continued, were staff responsible for reducing routine committee support work that he and Ms. Pinney have had to absorb and for the type of technical work encompassed in the priorities list. While he and other staff are trying to keep the pace of the Commission's work load when it had a larger staff, fewer staff resources is a significant factor that cannot be ignored and necessitates his and the Executive Committee's strategizing new and more efficient ways of getting needed work done, while work is substantially increasing in anticipation of upcoming changes (e.g., health care reform) and new County requirements (e.g., POs must be created for all expenses and the Commission can no longer rely on Executive Office master POs).
- Mr. Vincent-Jones prioritized tasks as follows:
 - 1) Health Insurance Premiums/Cost-Sharing (HIP/C-S) Focus Groups: Groups are needed quickly as OAPP is holding the RFP for consumer input. More consumers are needed, especially non-Commissioners, to ensure multiple views. No standard was developed at the time the service category was created since many changes were being considered. The 4-day estimate includes writing up summaries of the information developed.
 - 2) Sole Source PO Requests: Mosaica, Compass, Judy Walker, St. Anne's, and the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism (AAM) RFP Scope of Work: The Mosaica PO will oversee most consultants and eliminate the need for most individual POs for each consultant. The Compass PO is for web-based trainings. The PO for Ms. Walker is necessary for design services to complete the standards publication. The St. Anne's PO is for meeting space. That used to be paid by invoice and reimbursed, but the new eCAPS procurement system requires a PO. AAM is a long process, so work needs to begin now.
 - **3) Commission Ordinance**: The goal is to move revisions to the Board 12/10/2010. Background material also needs to be completed, but does not need to go to the Board.

- **4) 12/9/2010 Commission Meeting Materials**: Indicated materials are six policies, Latino and Consumer Caucuses' Work Plans, and incorporation of revisions into Membership Application materials.
- **5) Commission Handbook and Commission Orientation**: About 30% of the Handbook is done. It is needed for the Orientation scheduled for January.
- **6) Evaluation of Service Effectiveness (ESE) Provider Surveys**: Scheduling complications with the LA Gay and Lesbian Center have delayed completion of comment review. Comments to date have been productive.
- 7) Immigration/Naturalization Program/Planning Brief: The draft should be ready for the attorney in a few days. About 90 is done. The next work group meeting is being rescheduled from last week due to meeting conflicts.
- 8) Hospice/Skilled Nursing Study: The outline is being developed before Ms. Pinney can begin working on the draft.
- 9) Data Summit: The Summit is scheduled for 1/28/2010.
- **10)** Comprehensive Standards of Care Production (Editing/Design): Work will continue on this project during the holidays.
- Ms. Watt estimated that Mr. Vincent-Jones has approximately eight days a month for non-routine and other requirements. Priorities 1 through 3 represent an estimated 12.5 days of work, so she recommended a deadline of January 15 to complete those items and that the Commission and its Executive Committee support for him to block out the time needed for the work.
- Mr. Land indicated that completing the editing of the standards is an acute priority that will consume considerable time, and cannot be accomplished by delegating it to others. Mr. Vincent-Jones responded that he is going to try and block three days between Christmas and New Years to work on the project. The Committee agreed to support his effort to do so.
- The Health Insurance Premiums/Cost-Sharing focus groups: are scheduled at/for the CARE Program CAB, 12/7/2010, 12:00-2:00 pm; Commission offices, 12/14/2010, 2:00-4:00 pm. The Consumer Caucus is assisting with recruitment.
- ◆ Add Comprehensive Care Plan when specific tasks have been further identified.
- **MOTION 3**: (*Braswell/Land*): Mr. Vincent-Jones will complete priorities 1 through 3 by 1/15/2010 and/or explain delays and will work on Standards of Care editing during the holidays. Executive Committee and staff will work to provide Mr. Vincent-Jones uninterrupted time to accomplish goals (*Passed by Consensus*).
- **C. Commission Meeting Priority**: Commissioners will be called to determing a quorum for the 12/9/2010 Commission meeting. Mr. Engeran-Cordova, Mr. Goodman and Ms. Watt will be out-of-town. The meeting will be held in any case.
- **D. Succession Planning**: The next meeting is 12/2/2010.
- E. Commission/PPC Integration Task Force: The next regularly scheduled Integration Task Force meeting will be 12/6/2010,2:00-4:00 pm. A reminder would be emailed later in the day. Ms. Watt noted Phil Hendricks is leaving the PPC.

9. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- Mr. Vincent-Jones noted Policy/Procedure #09.2102: Executive Committee At-Large Member Elections and Terms in the packet. He is bringing the policy forward now as the three At-Large seats are up for election. Current nominees are Mr. Ballesteros and Mr. Land. There are also two nominees for the Commission Co-Chair seat: Mr. Braswell and Mr. Johnson.
- → Ms. Bailey, Mr. Braswell and Ms. Watt volunteered to review the Evaluation of the Annual Meeting Survey being developed by Mr. Vincent-Jones. It should be ready for review on 11/30/2010.
- Policy/Procedure #09.2102 approved to be opened for public comment at the 12/9/2010 Commission meeting.
- Mr. Braswell will call OAPP about consistent representation at the Executive Committee.
- 10. OFFICE OF AIDS PROGRAMS AND POLICY (OAPP) REPORT: OAPP will present at the Commission on the Ryan White application.
- 11. **HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY REPORT**: There was no report.
- 12. CONSUMER CAUCUS REPORT:
 - A. Consumer Caucus Work Plan: Mr. Land noted the Work Plan should be completed in a couple of days.
- 13. PREVENTION PLANNING COMMITTEE (PPC) REPORT:
 - A. PPC Restructuring:
 - Mr. Engeran-Cordova requested clarity on the JPP status under the new PPC structure.

- Ms. Watt said the PPC has sought JPP applications fruitlessly for 18 months, but individuals consistently attended meetings. Besides the Steering Subcommittee, there are now two subcommittees: External and Internal. The PPC will educate members over the next six months in hopes some will apply. Meanwhile, people will continue to attend as before.
- She confirmed items passed by JPP will continue to go to the Steering Subcommittee and then to the full PPC for approval.
- Mr. Engeran-Cordova noted increasing emphasis on a continuum of services that includes prevention, treatment and care. He supported reconsidering combining the bodies. Ms. Watt replied the Commission/PPC Integration Task Force has discussed similar aspects of the two plans that might be fused as well as differences in funding guidances.

14. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- **A. Operations**: Mr. Johnson said the Committee will review target dates for orientation and handbook work at its next meeting to ensure they are realistic and not burdensome. He noted consumers have long asked for this training.
 - 1. *Ordinance 3.29*: There was no additional discussion.
 - 2. Open Nominations Process Materials: There was no additional discussion.
 - 3. **Commission Handbook**: Mr. Vincent-Jones noted Operations has scheduled trainings after the January and February Commission meetings. January will cover the Commission Handbook and February will cover the committee handbooks. At least one co-chair from each committee should be available to present at each meeting.
 - 4. New Member Orientation: Mr. Johnson noted experienced Commissioners are not required to attend.
- **B.** Priorities and Planning (P&P): Ms. Watt noted two meetings scheduled for 11/30/2010: Comprehensive Care Plan Task Force in the morning and P&P Committee in the afternoon.
 - 1. **FY 2012 P-and-A Process**: Mr. Land will present P-and-A process recommendations at the 12/9/2010 Commission meeting. P&P has discussed a streamlined process as the last was done so recently and new data will not be available.
 - 2. Policies and Procedures: Pol #05.7601: Criteria and Designation of "Special Populations" was postponed.
- C. Joint Public Policy (JPP):
 - 1. JPP Work Priorities: There was no additional discussion.
 - 2. Policies and Procedures: The next four JPP policies and procedures to be considered were postponed.
- D. Standards of Care (SOC):
 - 1. Grievance Procedure: Mr. Vincent-Jones noted work needs to continue on this as it is part of the standards set.
 - 2. **Evaluation of Service Effectiveness**: There was no additional discussion.
 - 3. **AETC Presentation**: This presentation is being scheduled.

15. NEXT STEPS:

- **A.** Mr. Ballesteros noted Department of Health Services (DHS) discussions with the community on coverage. He asked if PWH not Medi-Cal eligible under current disability regulations are considered Seniors and Persons with Disabilities (SPDs) under the local Initiative. Mr. Engeran-Cordova said that Assembly bill was not fully implemented, so they are Coverage Initiative.
- **B.** Mr. Johnson said Coverage Initiative also has loopholes, is closely defined and has limited service slots. PWH interests are, however, being considered. Few key decisions will be made until after 1/3/2011 when the new DHS Director, Dr. Mitch Katz arrives.
- **C.** Mr. Johnson is on the new DHS Best Practices Committee, which has adopted the Commission's Standards of Care and will participate in ESE. Committee Chair Dr. Cadden is aware of needed changes to capture data with the new Disease Registry both for payment and to track patients entering managed plans. As specialty care is a focus, PWH are a natural population.
- **D.** Mr. Engeran-Cordova noted discussions about treatment for PWH are ongoing with the incoming Brown administration. Some Brown transition people have requested information and some briefing memorandums have been developed.
- E. Mr. Ballesteros felt Coverage Initiative funds were promising for PWH and might also be available for high-risk populations.
- Schedule meeting on this subject with Irene Dyer, Coverage Initiative Planning, DHS; Gretchen McGinley, Director, Ambulatory Care, DHS; Ms. Bailey, Mr. Braswell, Mr. Ballesteros, Mr. Engeran-Cordova, Mr. Johnson and Ms. Watt.
- 16. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**: There were no announcements.
- **17. ADJOURNMENT**: The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.